Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box + +

TRANSI	VII	ΓT	AL
FOF	RN		

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	09/850,301		
Filing Date	May 7, 2001	- -	
Inventor(s)	Mark A. Terrible		
Group Art Unit	2141		
Examiner Name	Le H. Luu		
Attorney Docket Number	129250-002069/US		

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)							
Fee Transmittal F	orm	Assignment Papers (for an Application)		After Allowance Communication to Group			
Fee Attached		Letter to the Official Draftsperson and Sheets of Formal Drawing(s)		BR	ITER SUBMITTING APPEAL IEF AND APPEAL BRIEF (w/clean sion of pending claims)		
Request For Reco	onsideration	Licensing-related Papers		(No	peal Communication to Group tice of Appeal, Appeal Brief, splemental Reply Brief)		
After Final		Petition		Proprietary Information			
☐ Affidavits/dec	laration(s)	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		Status Letter			
Extension of Time	e Request	Change of Correspondence Address and Revocation/POA			her Enclosure(s) ase identify below):		
Express Abandon	nment Request	☐ Terminal Disclaimer ☐ Request for Refund					
Information Disclo	osure Statement	CD, Number of CD(s)					
Certified Copy of Document(s)	Priority	Remarks					
Response to Miss Incomplete Applic							
Response to Miss Parts under 37 CI 1.52 or 1.53							
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT							
Firm or Individual name	CAPITOL PATENT TRADEMARK LAV	ENT & Attorney Name			Reg. No. 37,602		
Signature	John E. Curtin, Re	ohn E. Curtin, Registration No. 37,602					
Date	July 3, 2007						

IE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:

09/850,301

Filing Date:

May 7, 2001

Applicant:

Mark A. Terrible

Group Art Unit:

2141

Confirmation No: 2198

Examiner:

Le Hein Luu

Title:

TECHNIQUE FOR ANALYZING INTERNET TRAFFIC TO

SELECT HOT SPOTS

Attorney Docket: 129250-002069/US

APPLICANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF ON APPEAL

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS

Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

July 3, 2007

In response to the Examiner's Substitute Answer mailed June 4, 20077 the Applicant submits the following Reply.

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL

U.S. Application No.: 09/850,301

Atty. Docket: 129250-002069/US

BACKGROUND:

7

In the Examiner's Supplemental Answer mailed June 4, 2007 the

Examiner now includes U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0034792 to Swildens

as part of the evidence the Examiner is relying upon. To the extent that the

Examiner's Substitute Answer is permitted as of right (i.e., without first asking

the Board for permission or providing Applicant with notice), Applicant does

not oppose this submission. In all other respects, Applicant reserves its right

to oppose this additional submission if, and when, it is necessary.

The balance of Applicant's Reply remains the same as his original Reply.

ARGUMENTS:

(i) Chauvel Does Not Disclose or Suggest "Replaceable and Irreplaceable" Entries

As the Appellant pointed out in his opening brief, the Examiner does not

appear to have addressed the shortcomings of Chauvel raised by the Appellant

in his previous responses; this is still the case because the Examiner did not

address these shortcomings in the Examiner's Answer ("Answer") as well.

In the Answer, the Examiner appears to take the position that although

neither Peercy nor Doyle discloses or suggests the selection of an entry from a

set of replaceable entries in a table, where the table includes both replaceable

and irreplaceable entries as in claims 1-15 and 37-40, such a table is

nonetheless well-known as exemplified by Chauvel. The Examiner cites column

1, lines 46-52 in Chauvel in support of this position.

- 1 -

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL

U.S. Application No.: 09/850,301

Atty. Docket: 129250-002069/US

7 However, neither the excerpts cited by the Examiner nor any other part

of Chauvel discloses or suggests a table that includes both replaceable and

irreplaceable entries.

In fact, as the Appellant pointed out in his opening appellate brief, while

the excerpt cited by the Examiner appears to disclose some type of

irreplaceable entry (e.g., Chauvel's "locked entries") it does not disclose or

suggest replaceable entries.

Further, Chauvel explicitly states that a cache system that uses such

locked entries is undesirable because it further reduces the efficiency of a

Said another way, Chauvel explicitly teaches away from using cache.

irreplaceable entries to operate a cache.

Yet further, instead of using replaceable and irreplaceable entries to store

data in a cache or the like, Chauvel appears to use and/or configure additional

cache "subsystems" or "RAM set caches". As such, Chauvel has little need to

use or distinguish between replaceable and irreplaceable entries because when

Chauvel needs additional cache space it uses additional cache memory, instead

of writing over or replacing, replaceable data.

In sum, rather than being well-known as the Examiner alleges, the

claimed selection of an entry from a set of replaceable entries in a table, where

the table includes both replaceable and irreplaceable entries, is novel. Because

the Examiner has not presented any persuasive evidence to the contrary, the

- 2 -

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL

U.S. Application No.: 09/850,301

Attv. Docket: 129250-002069/US

Appellant respectfully requests that the members of the Board reverse the

decision of the Examiner and allow claims 1-15 and 37-40.

(ii) Peercy Does Not Disclose or Suggest An "Audio File"

In Appellant's opening brief, the Appellant pointed out that the excerpt

from Peercy (column 2, lines 19-31) relied on by the Examiner did not disclose

an audio file, cached resource as in claims 38, 40 and 42.

In the Answer the Examiner takes the position that Peercy's mention of

an HTML page is an inherent disclosure of a multimedia, audio file. Appellant

respectfully disagrees.

First, Peercy is directed to the creation of web page "hotlists" and the

"bookmarking' of URLs of web sites. It is not directed to the caching of audio or

multimedia files.

Second, while an HTML-formatted page may include audio information,

by no means is the phrase "HTML" synonymous with such information, nor

must an HTML page include such information, as the Examiner appears to

suggest.

For the Board's reference, the following Wikipedia definition (see

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HTML) for HTML does not refer to audio or

multimedia information; in fact, it defines HTML as a "means to describe the

structure of text-based information":

HTML, short for Hypertext Markup Language, is the predominant

markup language for the creation of web pages. It provides a means to describe the structure of text-based information in a document — by denoting certain text as headings, paragraphs, lists,

- 3 -

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL U.S. Application No.: 09/850,301 Atty. Docket: 129250-002069/US

and so on — and to supplement that text with interactive forms, embedded images, and other objects. HTML is written in the form of labels (known as tags), surrounded by less-than (<) and greater-than signs (>). HTML can also describe, to some degree, the appearance and semantics of a document, and can include embedded scripting language code which can affect the behavior of web browsers and other HTML processors.

Accordingly, the Appellant respectfully requests that the members of the Board reverse the decision of the Examiner and allow claims 38, 40 and 42.

Conclusion:

For the reasons stated above and in Appellant's opening brief, the Appellant respectfully requests that the members of the Board reverse the decision of the Examiner and allow claims 1-20, 22-31 and 33-42.

Respectfully submitted,

Capitol Patent & Trademark Law Firm, PLLC

By:

John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602

P.Ø. Box 1995

Vienna, Virginia 22183

(7**03**) 266-3330